



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

BS

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/416,331	10/12/1999	SHAUN S. AMINI	EYEC-001/00U	6010
26389	7590	05/03/2006	EXAMINER	
CHRISTENSEN, O'CONNOR, JOHNSON, KINDNESS, PLLC			AN, SHAWN S	
1420 FIFTH AVENUE			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SUITE 2800				
SEATTLE, WA 98101-2347			2621	

DATE MAILED: 05/03/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/416,331	AMINI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Shawn S. An	2621	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 March 2006.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 59-103 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 59-103 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Request for Continued Examination

1. The request filed on 3/6/06 for a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) under 37 CFR 1.114 based on parent Application No. 09/416,331 is acceptable and a RCE has been established. An action on the RCE follows.

Response to Amendment

2. As per Applicant's instructions as filed on 3/6/06, claims 1-58 have been canceled and claims 102-103 have been newly added.

Response to Remarks

3. Applicant's remarks as filed on 3/6/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The Applicant presents arguments of which Barraclough et al's reference fails to teach or suggest the following claimed limitations:

A) a central control site to initialize communication between a remote site and a supervisory site, and to enable offsite client workstations to effect communication with selected surveillance cameras, wherein the client workstation cannot initialize communication with the surveillance cameras. Similarly, the client workstation cannot directly access the associated video monitoring device without an initialization by the centralized control site; and

B) a central control site for providing real time control of surveillance cameras to one or more client workstations.

However, after careful scrutiny of the Barraclough et al's reference, the Examiner must respectfully disagree, and maintain the grounds of rejection for the reasons that follow.

As per argument A), Barraclough et al discloses the server (230) (a centralized off-site control site) acting as a video signal coordinator to permit a large number of remote-site (off-site client workstation) video processing units to communicate with one

or more supervisory video processing units (210a, 210b; controls surveillance cameras 240 and 242), [in the supervisory site (Fig. 2, 220)], based on an immediately established (on-line) or previously established business arrangement/payment (col. 6, lines 56-61), which clearly meets the claimed "a centralized off-site control site including at least one server ,... **to enable off-site client workstations to effect communication** with selected surveillance cameras, **wherein the off-site client workstation cannot directly access the associated video monitoring device without an initialization by the centralized control site**".

In other words, only the control site server establishes initialization of communication between the off-site client workstations and the selected surveillance camera(s) (video monitoring device) [controlled by supervisory video processing units] only based upon the established (on-line) or previously established business arrangement/payment. Therefore, the client workstation **cannot** possibly **initialize** communication with the surveillance cameras, because only the control site server establishes initialization of communication between the off-site client workstations and the selected surveillance camera(s). Similarly, the off-site client workstation cannot directly access the associated video monitoring device (camera) without an **initialization** by the centralized control site, wherein only way to establish the **initialization** by the centralized control site is only when the previously established business arrangement/payment (fee based service) has been made by clients.

As per argument B), please refer to the following new grounds of rejection corresponding to claims 102 and 103.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 59-70, 75-82, and 84-97 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barraclough et al (6,226,031 B1) as previously discussed in the last Office action as filed on 9/1/05.

6. Claims 71-74, 83, and 98-101 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barraclough et al (6,226,031 B1) in view of Pshtissky (4,714,959) as previously discussed in the last Office action as filed on 9/1/05.

7. Claims 102 and 103 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barraclough et al (6,226,031 B1).

Regarding claim 102, Barraclough et al discloses all of the claimed subject matter as discussed in the last Office action with the exception of the centralized control site providing real time control of a least one video monitoring device to at least one client workstations.

However, Barraclough et al also discloses the present invention has been found to be particularly advantageous in such applications involving real-time and delayed-time processing of video data (col. 3, lines 3-6). Barraclough et al further discloses the supervisory site initiating a live display mode for viewing by the remote unit (client workstations)(col. 8, lines 59-65), and that the centralized control site (230) (cited in the last office action) has been implemented as an optional device to act as a video signal coordinator between the remote site/unit and the supervisory site, and to permit/initiate a large number of remote-site (off-site client workstation) video processing units to communicate with one or more supervisory video processing units based on an immediately established (on-line) or previously established business arrangement/payment.

Therefore, it would have been considered obvious to a person of skill in the art incorporating all of the Barraclough et al's teachings as discussed above so that the centralized control site would have been able to provide real time control of a least one video monitoring device to at least one client workstations, since the centralized control

site's main function is to act as a video signal coordinator between the remote site/unit and the supervisory site, and to permit/initiate a large number of remote-site (client workstations) video processing units to communicate with one or more supervisory video processing units based on an immediately established (on-line) or previously established business arrangement/payment.

Regarding claim 103, Barracough et al discloses client workstations (remote-site) providing camera control commands to the supervisory site (Fig. 3a, 326); and forwarding the camera control commands to an appropriate video monitoring device, thereby the video monitoring device effecting the intended camera control (328).

Barracough et al does not particularly disclose client workstations (remote-site) providing camera control commands to the centralized control site, wherein the centralized control site processes the camera control commands to a format recognizable by the video monitoring device (camera).

However, as discussed above, the centralized control site (230) (cited in the last office action) has been implemented as an optional device to act as a video signal coordinator between the remote site/unit and the supervisory site, and to permit/initiate a large number of remote-site (off-site client workstation) video processing units to communicate with one or more supervisory video processing units.

Furthermore, the Examiner takes official notice that a controller such as a server processing the camera control commands to a format recognizable by a video monitoring device is conventionally well known in the video communication art for an efficient way to control (such as Pan, Tilt, and Zoom) video monitoring device from a remote place.

Therefore, it would have been considered obvious to a person of skill in the art incorporating all of the Barracough et al's teachings as discussed above so that the client workstations (remote-site) provides camera control commands to the centralized control site, since the centralized control site's main function is to act as a video signal coordinator between the remote site/unit and the supervisory site, and to permit/initiate a large number of remote-site video processing units to communicate with one or more supervisory video processing units, wherein the centralized control site could process

the camera control commands to a format recognizable by the video monitoring device (camera) for an efficient way to control (such as Pan, Tilt, and Zoom) video monitoring device from a remote place.

Conclusion

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to *Shawn S An* whose telephone number is 571-272-7324.
9. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).
10. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.



SHAWN AN
PRIMARY EXAMINER